

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 19, 2004 (Paper No. 18). Claims 76 to 79, 94 to 97, 106 and 109 are presented for examination, with Claims 39 to 75, 80 to 93, 98 to 105, 107, 108, 110 and 111 being withdrawn from consideration. Claims 39, 53, 67, 68, 76, 80, 86, 94, 98 and 104 to 111 are in independent form. Claims 76, 94, 106 and 109 have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 76, 77, 94 and 95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,744,232 (Tabata); Claims 78, 79, 96 and 97 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tabata in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,335,796 (Endo); and Claims 106 and 109 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tabata. Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns outputting image data to an output medium. An outputting area is designated to be outputted to an output medium. According to one feature of the invention, the output area is designated in image data obtained by computerizing an input image (or representing a photographed image), based on at least one of information indicating a state of an X-ray irradiation and a photographed portion of the image.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 76 as amended is directed to an image outputting system for outputting image data to an output medium. The image outputting system includes designation means for designating an outputting area, in image data obtained by computerizing an input image, to be outputted to an output medium, based on at least one of information indicating a state of an X-ray irradiation and

a photographed portion of the image. The image outputting system also includes selection means for selecting one of a plurality of output medium sizes, and determination means for determining an output mode based on a relationship between the designated outputting area and the output medium size selected by said selection means.

In a similar manner, independent Claims 94 as amended defines the invention in terms of a method.

Independent Claim 106 as amended is directed to a photographing system for photographing an object and outputting image data to an output medium based on photographed object image. The photographing system includes photographing means for photographing an object and obtaining image data representing a photographed object image. The photographing system also includes designation means for designating an outputting area to be outputted to an output medium, in the image data, based on at least one of information indicating a state of an X-ray irradiation and a photographed portion of the object. In addition, the photographing system includes selection means for selecting one of a plurality of output medium sizes, and determination means for determining an output mode based on a relationship between the designated outputting area and output medium size selected by said selection means.

In a similar manner, independent Claim 109 as amended defines the invention in terms of a method.

The applied art is not seen to teach or suggest the features of the present invention. In particular, neither Tabata nor Endo are seen to teach or disclose at least the feature of designating an outputting area, in image data obtained by computerizing an input

image (or representing a photographed image), based on at least one of information indicating a state of an X-ray irradiation and a photographed portion of the image.

As understood by Applicants, Tabata teaches an image recording apparatus comprising feeding means for automatically feeding a sheet document, and a recording paper inverting mechanism for inverting recording paper with a image recorded thereon. The apparatus recognizes a size of the sheet document fed thereto, divides the read image into two portions when a size of the document is larger than recording paper having a specified size, and executes image processing for displacing a central position of each divided image to be aligned with an edge of a binding space of each discrete sheet of recording paper. The apparatus inverts either one of a first sheet of recording paper and a second sheet of recording paper with the recording paper inverting mechanism. See Tabata, column 16, line 62 to column 17, line 8.

However, Tabata is not seen to disclose or suggest designating an output area in image data obtained by computerizing an input image (or representing a photographed image), based on at least one of information indicating a state of an X-ray irradiation and a photographed portion of the image. Rather, Tabata merely divides the read image into two portions when a size of the document is larger than recording paper.

Endo, which was applied in the rejection of certain dependent claims, is not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Endo. As understood by Applicants, Endo teaches an image-pickup apparatus in which an operator can designate output as "life-size" (printing an X-rayed human body or the like at the same size as the original body), "cost" (printing as inexpensively as possible), "degree of emergency" (printing as quickly as possible), "gradation" (printing in as many tones as possible), and "resolution" (printing at

the highest possible resolution). See Endo, column 10, line 60 to column 11, line 2; and Figure 2. However, Endo is not seen to teach designating an output area in image data obtained by computerizing an input image (or representing a photographed image), based on at least one of information indicating a state of an X-ray irradiation and a photographed portion of the image.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 76, 94, 106 and 109 as amended are believed to be allowable over the applied references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) and § 103(a) rejections are respectfully requested.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,  
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to  
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 32622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 81322v1